3/30/70

Dear Dick,

It was good to get your long letter of the 19th concerning my Fil. interviews. Same for the other stuff on Lifton.

LIFTON: Thanks for filling me in on what has transpired between the two of you concerning me, and for telling Harold. I would also have told him that you did not encourage me to contact Dave. It seems odd to me that he has not yet answered my letter. But I really do not care. From the photostat of his letter to you (you sent me a carbon of the letter to which he was responding), I could readily see what a devious and disturbed person he is.

FIL: Your comments are quite good. Both Harold and I realize that while he is an expert in forensic pathology, he is not an assassination expert, and anything he says outside of his expertise cannot be regarded as "expert opinion." Everyone has seemed to pick this up, based largely on some of his misconceptions about the assassination.

What I tried to develop on "high velocity" was a confirmation of Frazier's remark that the MC is not a high velocity weapon.

What you say of cast bullets interests me for I am quite puzzled as to what could have been fired into the head from the rear. The 6.5mm fragment in the entrance hole in the head certainly does not seem to be indicative of a jacketed bullet, and F says it would mean a "low velocity" one. Also remember what I discovered in the Humes pix and X-ray report--at one time before the massive explosion, there was a 3cm. exit hole in the head, probably the right top. There are characteristics about this hole too which would indicate low velocity and no jacket. Remember something very important: it is all but impossible for two <u>high</u> velocity bullets to have hit the head. One coming in from the rear would produce enough damage so that another one would be like "shooting into mud" as F told me off of the tape. Almost definately, a high velocity one came in from the front. This, in turn, would have to indicate one of more modest velocity from the rear. But what kind of bullet would pass through the skull leaving such neat entrance and exit, minimal skull fracturing, and a large fragment in its entrance hole? Perhaps you could suggest something. Same goes for the fragments in the neck as I have recently described to you. I'd really like to know what you make of such an arrangement (many, many tiny fragments in a small area).

You mentioned a hunch you had about the path of fragments in the head. It drives me wild also when people write like that yet I do it unintentionally all the time. I believe I made the suggestion once that this was a tract which came from a front entering bullet. I get the impression from what you write that you might see some tampering with the head from this. Just a guess.

Your comments on F and the head movement (excuse me! head <u>and body</u> movement) are tremendous. And well taken. Note F's statement that if a bullet came in at 180 degrees from front with one from rear, it could produce the same tract in brain. Remember also that is the rear shot just went clear through the <u>top</u> of the head, it might produce little if no tract in the brain. But 180 degrees to the right rear at 313 defines the south grassy knoll, about which Harold often speaks.

That is, I must admit, one of the most ideal spots for a shooter to have placed himself in Dealey plaza that day. It was within 100 yards of any street in the Plaza, so it would have been immaterial which one the motorcade came down, plus the fact that there wasn't a damned person around as opposed to the north knoll. Likewise, there as a parking lot behind the south knoll and all attention was directed away from it both before and after the shooting. It is even possible that a gunman position himself in the pergola on the south knoll and shoot through one of the small windows in it or possible go in back of the concrete wall connecting the two pergolas and shoot from in between the gratings. This is a good possibility and there is nothing about the head movement to refute it.

I'm sure F knows a lot more about the thing than he is saying. Remember that he is a good friend of Finck.

While he may be incorrect at my fault about seeing the front neck wound, he was pretty sharp in questioning both what is written in the WR("completely cut away") and in the Panel report when he says that they could not tell if it was a bullet wound. He also does not say much for Fisher's integrity when he syas that no forensic pathologist would make such a statement.

Agreed on artery (blood vessel) damage in neck. If true, it is another case where Humes perjured/suppressed. I no longer think it so important to particularly prove perjury for I view the suppression of this data as tantamount to it, certainly as contemptuous as it.

From the tape, it sounds as if F is saying that the fragments in the neck could not have come from 399 base. I think he knows better than to assert absolutely that fragments never come offf hte base. I should have probed.

I agree with what you say about his shooter position comments. He has an awful lot of mistaken notions about LHO which greatly influence his thinking there. He thinks that the WC found some significance to the map marked by LHO in job-hunting, ect.

I think when F said "Kennedy ballistics" he was referring to the type of projectile alleged to have killed JFK. I'll review the tape to see if I did transcribe wrong.

KELLY: It sure was a dandy.
Your remarks on the press are good, but I think they are perhaps too strong, too absolute. I view the pressas contributory but not entirely to blame. While I have not read any of Harold's Coup D'Etat, I suspect he must touch largely on these matters, especially with the military. I would very much like to read Coup sometime for I do not believe I have a proper understanding of the consequenses of the assassinations, and I believe it deals with this too. OSwald in NO was a great help in my understanding of the "plot" although I have really no time to delve into this.

Stay well and best wishes.

cc Harold